



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

fighters and so accordingly each slew his man by a peculiar method, Meges by a blow in the mouth and Eurypylus by severing his hand; thus again in the method of fighting we have the arrangement *ab ab cc*. Other minute responses in regard to the men slain, the manner of flight, and the importance of the Trojans are also pointed out.

Between each scene of blood the gods are burlesqued, in order to relieve the strain. It is the setting of the poem and not the religious feelings of the poet which decided in each case when and how the gods are to be treated. Diomedes and Achilles must be kept heroic throughout, but the gods could be handled with absolute freedom; hence any attempt to divide Homer on the basis of respect or reverence for the gods is absurd.

Every part of this rhapsode, Book v., fits itself into every other part, scene responds to scene, act to act, with a perfection and harmony which carry their own conclusions. This harmony is made without the rejection of a single well-attested verse. Professor Drerup did not try to rewrite or improve Homer, but simply to study the poem as it is. The balanced harmony he has discovered is that which the Greeks observed in architecture as well as in lyric and dramatic poetry. The very fact that scene responded to scene made interpolations impossible, since an interpolated scene would betray itself by its lack of response. If the corresponding scene were also added, then the act would be out of correspondence, and so through the larger harmonies of the whole. So long as these harmonies were understood no one would be permitted to destroy them by additions, and when they were forgotten the text of Homer was too well established and too widely known to admit of interpolations.

This book is the most complete and thorough argument for unity with which I am familiar, since no well-attested verse is excluded and the force of the argument makes deliberate alterations and additions impossible. No unprejudiced reader will be surprised to learn that the author has recently been elected Professor of Classics in the University of Würzburg. This honor could not long be withheld from so sane and brilliant a scholar.

JOHN A. SCOTT

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

De Lucretiani libri primi condicione ac retractatione scripsit
JOACHIMUS MUSSEHL. Tempelhof, near Berlin, 1912. Pp. 182.

Year by year Lachmann's foundations of Lucretian criticism are being undermined: the archetype, the rigorous limitation of vocabulary and syntax, the interpretation of the philosophy, the extent of incompleteness of the poem by the author—all these principles have been modified to such a degree that little more than the establishment of the text on the two Leyden manuscripts is left; and, as the Vossian codices are now available in Sijthoff's

photographic reproduction, one may expect a lively activity in the field of conjectural emendation.

Mussehl's Greifswald dissertation is a valuable contribution. It falls into four divisions: the first chapter deals with the poem as a whole and discusses the number of the books, the prooemia, the use of introductory particles, of parenthesis, and the general technique. The second chapter gives a minute analysis of the first book with special reference to the lacunae postulated by editors. Mussehl recognizes only three: those at 860, 1013, and 1093, all of which are due to copyists and not to the poet. The third chapter considers the condition of the other five books and their order of composition and their state of completeness or incompleteness. An appendix follows in two parts; the first contains a discussion of *quod superest, res, and ignes*, and the second deals with ten difficult passages in book iv.

The author's general position is that the poem is far nearer completion than has hitherto been considered. Here he was anticipated by Valk in 1902, whose reasoning, however, was far less cogent. Lacunae and transpositions Mussehl generally rejects; many stop-gaps he shows are inadequate; apparent duplication of arguments is proved to be demanded by Lucretius' method. He writes with a full knowledge of Lucretian literature, and subjects Brieger and Giussani and others to searching criticism. He has an open mind and appreciates the good in Bockemueler, and he does not altogether disregard the work before Lachmann. He is usually cautious, but some of his conclusions will be questioned in the light of the evidence of Epicurus himself: thus the treatment of i. 599 ff. and of 958–1051 might perhaps be modified by a closer examination of sections 41–42 and 58 of the letter to Herodotus.

The most valuable part of the dissertation is the careful analysis of the poem, and this is based on certain general principles. The author maintains that the argumentation is introduced by the particles *nam* (*namque, principio, enim, primum*) followed by *praeterea* (*porro, tum porro, quod superest* twice) continued at times by *deinde* (*tum, etiam*); the next member is introduced by *huc accedit*, then what follows by *denique*, and the last proof by *postremo*. Again, there are parentheses within arguments: thus 254–61 is a parenthesis within i. 250–64. This latter hypothesis is most ingenious and is destined to have much influence on future editors, but it can hardly be accepted for i. 469–77.

Mussehl thinks that all of the books except iv were practically finished by the poet; vi was written at odd times as a relief from the laborious effort given to the other books—a strange hypothesis, but not more strange than the theory that iii was written between iv. 822 and 823. Another position that is hardly tenable is that v. 146–55 originally occupied the place of ii. 1090–1104, or the still more grotesque hypothesis that the leaf containing iv. 217–29 was not returned to its right place after being removed by the poet in copying vi. 923–35. Lucretius himself perhaps failed to continue vi.

1246, and he did not put v. 110–234 and vi. 608–38 in their proper order; v. 306–23 is not in its proper place and v. 1436–47 with vi. 608–38 needed further treatment; otherwise the defects in the condition of the poem are due to manuscript tradition, except in the fourth book, which was unfinished by the poet.

This dissertation will repay close study and its arguments deserve most careful consideration.

W. A. MERRILL

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

De Hieronymo Donati Discipulo. (Commentationes Philologae Ienenses IX, Fasc. II.) By FRIDERICUS LAMMERT. Leipzig: Teubner, 1912. Pp. 75. M. 3.20.

From three passages in which Jerome alludes to Donatus as his teacher, Lammert proceeds to a search in Jerome's works for parallels in thought and expression to the *Artes grammaticae*, the commentary on Terence, and the remnants of the Virgil commentary. The validity of several of these parallels might well be questioned, and the author has sought to forestall such objection by an explicit statement (p. 7) that he does not assert actual use of the works of Donatus by Jerome, but rather suggests reminiscences of his early training under Donatus. Even with such a proviso, however, there is probably little significance in the fact that Jerome as well as Donatus recognizes usage (*consuetudo*) in the choice of words (p. 6), or understands and explains the plural force of a collective noun used in the singular (p. 6). There are much more satisfactory parallels adduced than these, especially when Lammert passes from the *Artes* to the richer field of the Terence commentary, but even here an occasional one must be somewhat discounted. For example, *aiunt divinare sapientes* (p. 13) happens to be used only by Donatus and Jerome, yet its form shows it to be a proverb, and that a proverb should have been limited in use to a teacher and his pupil appears a contradiction in terms.

To the master's influence Lammert would also trace most of the pupil's knowledge of rhetoric (as shown in his use or explanations of rhetorical terms), and a considerable amount of his acquaintance with law, though the passages in which this knowledge is seen may bear no likeness to any extant part of the works of Donatus. Even here Jerome's own statement (*In ep. ad Gal. i. 2. 11 f.*) that in his youth he frequently attended law courts should caution us against making Donatus the sole source of his not remarkably extensive acquaintance with law.

After these comparisons with the remains of Donatus the endeavor is made to discover likenesses between Jerome and the commentators who may have employed the works of Donatus which are now lost, and this inquiry occupies the greater part of the pamphlet (pp. 27–75). Where agreement